

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
SHERMAN DIVISION**

CRAIG CUNNINGHAM, §  
§  
Plaintiff, § CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:19-CV-00902-ALM-  
v. § CAN  
§  
JP3 ENTERPRISES, LLC D/B/A MY §  
VEHICLE PROTECTION, ET AL., §  
§  
Defendants. §

**ORDER**

Pending before the Court are Plaintiff Craig Cunningham's ("Plaintiff") "Motion for a Court Order Directing Verizon to Produce the Subscriber Information as Requested in the Subpoena" ("Motion for Court Order") [Dkt. 42] and "Motion for Sanctions and a Finding of Contempt" ("Motion for Sanctions") [Dkt. 43]. In Plaintiff's Motion for Court Order, Plaintiff fails to provide a copy of the subpoena. Additionally, it appears Verizon may not have been served with a copy of Plaintiff's Motion for Court Order. The Court, on the present record, is unable to determine whether Plaintiff complied with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45, Verizon is aware of Plaintiff's Motion for Court Order, and/or if the Court is the proper court to consider the instant Motion for Court Order. For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff's Motion for Court Order and Motion for Sanctions should each be denied without prejudice. Accordingly,

It is therefore **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Court Order [Dkt. 42] and Motion for Sanctions [Dkt. 43] are each **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**SIGNED** this 12th day of May, 2020.